

VZCZCXYZ0000  
PP RUEHWEB

DE RUEHUNV #0163/01 1041531  
ZNR UUUUU ZZH  
P 141531Z APR 09  
FM USMISSION UNVIEVIENNA  
TO RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 9296  
RMCSUU/DEPT OF ENERGY WASHINGTON DC PRIORITY  
RUEANFA/NRC WASHDC PRIORITY  
INFO RUEHII/VIENNA IAEA POSTS COLLECTIVE PRIORITY

UNCLAS UNVIE VIENNA 000163

SENSITIVE  
SIPDIS

STATE FOR IO/T, E/CBA, ISN/MNSA, ISN/NESS - BURKART, HUMPHREY  
STATE FOR USAID  
NA-242-MCCLELLAND-KERR; NE - WELLING  
NRC FOR OIP - HENDERSON, SCHWARTZMAN, COMMERCE FOR ITA - SARAH LOPP

E.O. 12958: N/A

TAGS: [AORC](#) [KNNP](#) [IAEA](#) [ENRG](#) [TRGY](#) [BEXP](#) [EAID](#)

SUBJECT: IAEA: COORDINATION OF INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE TO MEMBER  
STATE NUCLEAR INFRASTRUCTURES

This is an action request.

-----  
Summary and Comment  
-----

11. (SBU) Summary: On March 27, MsnOffs met with a group of senior IAEA managers to discuss coordination of infrastructure assistance activities related to the expansion of nuclear power. Graham Andrew, S&T Advisor to Director General ElBaradei, requested the meeting in response to Mission's invitation to the IAEA to take part in a planned U.S. workshop among "donor" states to harmonize assistance on safeguards infrastructure. The IAEA briefed MsnOffs on the structure and process the Secretariat is putting in place to ensure internal coordination of IAEA infrastructure assistance. IAEA officials appealed to the United States to look to the recipient states to take responsibility for driving international support efforts. This would both ensure developing states' buy-in, as well as avoid any perception that the developed states were using "infrastructure assistance" as a Trojan horse to press for more non-proliferation measures. After MsnOffs assured the IAEA management team of the U.S. intent to closely coordinate with the IAEA and to avoid the perception of a "Trojan horse," IAEA officials indicated their willingness to participate in the pending U.S.-sponsored workshop (DOE/NNSA's International Nuclear Safeguards Engagement Program (INSEP) plans to hold the workshop this Spring in Vienna). In a follow-on discussion with MsnOffs on April 7, Andrew indicated interest in additional U.S.-sponsored cost-free expert (CFE) assistance to implement international coordination of infrastructure-building assistance. Andrew reiterated several times during the discussion that the Director General has specified that effective coordination and provision of assistance in this regard is the Agency's top priority in the area of nuclear energy.

12. (U) Comment: The IAEA is clearly anxious to avoid being seen as part of any developed states' effort to define infrastructure support narrowly and primarily as a non-proliferation tool, vice a broader enabling of nuclear power-related capabilities. The Secretariat wants to ensure consistency of message, and MsnOffs suggested they raise Member State awareness of the IAEA's coordination effort by briefing it at INSEP's planned workshop. Unless otherwise directed, Mission will seek to coordinate closely with the IAEA pursuant to its Nuclear Power Support Group (NPSG) procedures laid out in the IAEA briefing (emailed to Department/DOE/NRC). Mission requests revised instructions should Washington desire any departure from our standing guidance to support and promote safe, secure, and well-safeguarded nuclear infrastructures in NPT states in good-standing who choose to develop nuclear power (see para. 10 action request). End comment and

summary.

-----  
IAEA Coordination Effort Taking Shape  
-----

13. (U) Andrew began the meeting by welcoming the opportunity to discuss infrastructure coordination with the United States. He noted that "one size does not fit all" in terms of the needs of recipient states and that the IAEA believed it was essential for recipient states to play a leading role in defining the pace and content of the assistance they would be receiving. Drawing an analogy to IAEA Technical Cooperation projects, Andrew said the recipients should also make a financial contribution. Andrew said recipient states should actively coordinate their own receipt of training over the long term, noting that it takes approximately 15 years or so to build a first nuclear power plant. Andrew summarized his opening comments by observing that "we don't want to rush support, we want to get it right." (Comment: Andrew's latter comment reflects concerns he shared privately with MsnOff that the planned INSEP workshop not/not be seen as "dictating" to recipient states what they need. It was clearly implied by Andrew's comments that he would not be in favor of IAEA participation if that were the case. He also hoped that the U.S. workshop would not inadvertently undercut the effort he is trying to drive within the IAEA to achieve internal IAEA coordination of infrastructure support, and then better IAEA coordination with the international community. End comment.)

14. (U) Nuclear Power Division Director Omoto gave a presentation (REF A) describing the process the IAEA is developing for coordinating its infrastructure assistance programs. The Secretariat believes this should be a demand-driven process, organized to meet the needs of the countries seeking assistance in capacity building for nuclear power. A major component of the

IAEA's plans is the Integrated Nuclear Infrastructure Review (INIR) Mission, which states would request through the Technical Cooperation Program, with a pilot mission planned in 2009. To support this effort, the Agency is also building Country Nuclear Power Profiles (public documents) and a Country Nuclear Infrastructure Profile database (for internal use, including assessments and country-specific support plans). The Secretariat has established a senior inter-departmental Nuclear Power Support Group (NPSG) to develop the policy framework for this effort, many of whose members were in the meeting. (Note: TC Africa Division Director Ali Boussaha chairs the NPSG, but Omoto has been tasked to take the lead on implementation of internal coordination and outreach to Member States)

15. (U) In discussion, the IAEA noted that an integrated approach to infrastructure, especially with countries in the early stages of planning a nuclear power program, is an effective way to present safety, security and safeguards in a broader context and to build a culture of transparency and openness around new nuclear power programs. Director of the Office of Nuclear Security, Anita Nilsson, stressed the importance of engaging states early on good security and safety practices, and argued that doing so should be seen as a benefit that "enables" states nuclear power aspirations, not a burden that "suppresses" them. The IAEA officials emphasized the importance of a demand-driven approach for both practical and political reasons: Member States receiving support need to show commitment if they are serious about developing a nuclear power program. A donor-driven process risks being seen as imposing conditions on developing countries. In the IAEA's view it is important that states are committed to take all appropriate steps and are transparent.

-----  
Overcoming IAEA Wariness on Donor Meeting  
-----

16. (U) MsnOff explained plans for the safeguards infrastructure donor harmonization workshop planned by INSEP. The first part of the workshop would be a session to exchange information among current providers of safeguards assistance, including the IAEA, to ensure that these efforts are consistent in substance and do not duplicate one another, and to identify gaps in their coverage.

Cooley endorsed this as a worthwhile effort in its own right. While acknowledging and supporting the IAEA vision of a demand-driven, integrated approach to infrastructure support, Cooley noted that it was not too early for such donor harmonization so long as it is seen as being done within the context of the broader IAEA coordination effort. She cited a recent series of overlapping safeguards-related training courses in Vietnam as an example of the inefficiencies and confusion that can arise from donors taking an uncoordinated approach. MsnOff explained that the second part of the workshop would allow donor states and the IAEA to begin a dialogue on how they see safeguards assistance fitting into the context of broader infrastructure coordination efforts. The states could underscore the central role safeguards -- and more broadly 3S (safety, security and safeguards/non-proliferation) -- should play in infrastructure. The IAEA could provide an update on its emerging infrastructure development coordination procedures, as described in the IAEA presentation.

17. (U) The Secretariat raised the question of timing. Most of the countries interested in nuclear power are in a very early phase of planning, with limited capacity to absorb assistance. Boussaha noted that assistance should be provided in a strategic manner, since many of the countries lack adequate planning capacity, and should be timed appropriately to their stage of development. In the case of safeguards, it may be 10 years or longer before they are ready for and need training in material accountancy.

18. (U) In the end, IAEA participants indicated they would support the proposed workshop, both by participating and by helping to set the stage. The Secretariat is organizing a consultancy meeting on infrastructure May 7-8 in Vienna, which could lay the groundwork for the INSEP workshop (and possibly others) by recommending follow-on topical workshops. Agency participants hoped that endorsement by the May 7-8 meeting, in which "recipient" states will participate, will help avoid any misperception that the U.S. workshop is part of an effort by developed states to dictate to developing states what they need, or to place sole emphasis on safeguards and security issues, rather than the more general technical assistance developing states would like to receive.

-----  
Comment and Action Request  
-----

19. (SBU) Comment: Mission sees Andrew's effort to drive an internal IAEA coordination process as a sincere effort to bring together Safety, Security, Nuclear Power, and Safeguards components of the IAEA bureaucracy that have not been well-coordinated on infrastructure support to date. We see this effort as dovetailing with USG efforts toward the same end. In this regard, Mission is pursuing a strategic approach to placement of U.S.-funded CFE's within the Secretariat to help manage and implement coordination of infrastructure support. We are pursuing discussions to replace one CFE within the Division of Nuclear Energy working with Omoto. (Note: Anne Starz, Technical Secretary to the NSWG, has been supporting development of the IAEA's infrastructure support efforts, and has been offered a regular staff position, replacing her departing supervisor Ian Facer. She will be key to the success of the Secretariat's coordination effort, and will be the Scientific Secretary for the upcoming workshop in May.) Mission has heard from the French Mission that France may also seek to place a CFE in the same Division; Mission recommends having U.S. persons in position to help ensure that any activity undertaken by the French also serves U.S. interests. Also, the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is planning to fund another CFE for infrastructure coordination. Given the lack of enthusiasm for the IAEA's infrastructure efforts Mission has observed in DDG Taniguchi and the IAEA's safety-related divisions over which he presides, Mission is working to place any NRC-sponsored CFE within the Department of Nuclear Safety and Security in order to help prompt and facilitate work across Department lines. (Note: The NRC is also funding a parallel CFE at the Nuclear Energy Agency in Paris. These two CFEs will work together to share information and hopefully coordinate some of IAEA's and NEA's activities. We have also heard interest from the Technical Cooperation Asia division in finding a U.S. private sector expert to replace the departing Japanese private sector cost free expert working on nuclear power infrastructure. In an April 7 meeting with MsnOffs, Andrew indicated clear interest in the

provision of such U.S-sponsored CFEs, but referred MsnOffs to the line managers to work out details of their placement and role. In the course of the conversation, Andrew reiterated several times that Director General ElBaradei has specified that provision of well-coordinated international assistance to member state's nuclear infrastructure-building efforts is the Agency's top priority in the nuclear energy area (IAEA Major Program 1).

¶10. (SBU) Finally, Mission requests guidance as soon as possible for how to characterize to our Vienna interlocutors-including at the IAEA and within the "Friends of Nuclear Energy" group in which we participate--the status of and relationship among various U.S. infrastructure support activities, including those under the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership, those undertaken with Russia, and those being undertaken by the NRC and INSEP.

¶11. (U) Participants

IAEA participants:

Graham Andrew, S&T Advisor to the Director General

Akira Omoto, Nuclear Power Division Director

Ali Boussaha, Technical Cooperation Africa Division Director and Chairman of the NPSG

Jill Cooley, Safeguards Concepts and Planning Director

Frederic Claude, Advisor to the Deputy Director General for Safeguards

Anita Nilsson, Nuclear Security Office Director

Johan Rautenbach, Director, Office of Legal Affairs,

Anne Starz, Nuclear Power Division, technical secretary to the NPSG

U.S. Participants

Kurt Kessler, Deputy IAEA counselor

Mark Goodman, Science Attache

Lisa Hilliard, Science Attache

Heather Astwood, Nuclear Safety Attache

SCHULTE